

**STATE FOREST LAND
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST**

Purpose of Checklist:

The State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), chapter 43.21C RCW, requires all governmental agencies to consider the environmental impacts of a proposal before making decisions. An environmental impact statement (EIS) must be prepared for all proposals with probable significant adverse impacts on the quality of the environment. The purpose of this checklist is to provide information to help you and the agency identify impacts from your proposal (and to reduce or avoid impacts from the proposal, if it can be done) and to help the agency decide whether an EIS is required.

Instructions for Applicants:

This environmental checklist asks you to describe some basic information about your proposal. Governmental agencies use this checklist to determine whether the environmental impacts of your proposal are significant, requiring preparation of an EIS. Answer the questions briefly, with the most precise information known, or give the best description you can. *Questions in italics are supplemental to Ecology's standard environmental checklist. They have been added by the DNR to assist in the review of state forest land proposals. Adjacency and landscape/watershed-administrative-unit (WAU) maps for this proposal are available on the DNR internet website at <http://www.dnr.wa.gov> under "SEPA Center." These maps may also be reviewed at the DNR regional office responsible for the proposal. This checklist is to be used for SEPA evaluation of state forest land activities.*

You must answer each question accurately and carefully, to the best of your knowledge. In most cases, you should be able to answer the questions from your own observations or project plans without the need to hire experts. If you really do not know the answer, or if a question does not apply to your proposal, write "do not know" or "does not apply." Complete answers to the questions now may avoid unnecessary delays later. *All of the questions are intended to address the complete proposal as described by your response to question A-11. The proposal acres in question A-11 may cover a larger area than the forest practice application acres, or the actual timber sale acres.*

Some questions ask about governmental regulations, such as zoning, shoreline, and landmark designations. Answer these questions if you can. If you have problems, the governmental agencies can assist you.

The checklist questions apply to all parts of your proposal, even if you plan to do them over a period of time or on different parcels of land. Attach any additional information that will help describe your proposal or its environmental effects. The agency to which you submit this checklist may ask you to explain your answers or provide additional information reasonably related to determining if there may be significant adverse impact.

Use of checklist for nonproject proposals:

Complete this checklist for nonproject proposals, even though questions may be answered "does not apply." IN ADDITION, complete the SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NON PROJECT ACTIONS (part D).

For nonproject actions, the references in the checklist to the words "project," "applicant," and "property or site" should be read as "proposal," "proposer" and "affected geographic area," respectively.

A. BACKGROUND

1. *Name of proposed project, if applicable:*

Timber Sale Name: DRY CANYON

Agreement #: 76192

2. *Name of applicant:* Washington State Department of Natural Resources

3. *Address and phone number of applicant and contact person:*

Department of Natural Resources
P.O. Box 190
Colville, WA 99114-0190

Contact Person: Bob McKellar Phone: (509) 684-7474

4. *Date checklist prepared:* May 14, 2004

5. *Agency requesting checklist:* Washington Department of Natural Resources

6. *Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable):*

- a. *Auction Date:* November 16, 2004
- b. *Planned contract end date (but may be extended):* October 31, 2006
- c. *Phasing:* None

7. *Do you have any plans for future additions, expansion, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal? If yes, explain.*

Timber Sale:

- a. *Site preparation:* Normal ground disturbance associated with yarding operations.
- b. *Regeneration Method:* All units will be artificially regenerated.
- c. *Vegetation Management:* Underburning and or pile burning may occur following harvest
- d. *Thinning:* The timber sale units will be evaluated after harvest completion to determine if manipulation of stocking levels is needed to increase production and improve forest health. In addition, this work is dependent on budget availability.

Roads:

Road maintenance needs will be assessed during active periods of timber haul, and annually thereafter. Road maintenance will include, but will not be limited to, periodic ditch and culvert cleanout, and road grading to ensure a road that will readily shed water from the running surface (also refer to A.11.c.).

Rock Pits and/or Sale: See A.11.c.

Other: Firewood cutting of logging slash.

8. List any environmental information you know about that has been prepared, or will be prepared, directly related to this proposal.

☐ 303 (d) – listed water body in WAU: ☐ temp ☐ sediment ☐ completed TMDL (total maximum daily load):
☐ Landscape plan:
☒ Watershed analysis: LeClerc Creek Watershed Analysis WAU #620316
☐ Interdisciplinary team (ID Team) report:
☒ Road design plan: Dated 6/28/2004
☒ Wildlife report: Memo from Scott Fisher dated 7/19/2004
☐ Geotechnical report:
☐ Other specialist report(s):
☐ Memorandum of understanding (sportsmen's groups, neighborhood associations, tribes, etc.):
☐ Rock pit plan:
☒ Other: GIS generated maps showing: Soil types, mass wasting potential, erosion potential, soil stability, habitat type, and hydrologic maturity of the LeClerc Creek and Middle Creek WAUs; Department of Natural Resources (DNR) TRAX; DNR Forest Resource Plan dated July 1992; Environmental Impact Statement, July 1992; DNR Smoke Management Plan, April 1993, revised 1995; Lynx Habitat Management Plan, 1996; Selkirk Grizzly Bear Recovery Plan; State Soil Survey.

9. Do you know whether applications are pending for governmental approvals of other proposals directly affecting the property covered by your proposal? If yes, explain.

None Known.

10. List any government approvals or permits that will be needed for your proposal, if known.

☐ HPA ☒ Burning permit ☐ Shoreline permit ☐ Incidental take permit ☒ FPA # _____ ☐ Other:

11. Give brief, complete description of our proposal, including the proposed uses and the size of the project and site. There are several questions later in this checklist that ask you to describe certain aspects of your proposal. You do not need to repeat those answers on this page. (Lead agencies may modify this form to include specific information on project description.)

a. Complete proposal description:

This proposal involves timber harvest, road construction, reconstruction, and maintenance on five harvest units totaling approximately 245 gross acres. There are approximately 232 net acres. Unit boundaries for the timber sale, in general, were located with consideration given to stand types, forest health, harvesting methods, efficiency, and environmental protection.

Additionally, Units 1, 2, 4, and 5 are part of a Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation, and Research (CMER) study testing water temperature following a harvest conducted to Washington Forest Practice (WFP) standards on Type 3 waters (fish bearing). The study area includes 2000 feet of stream reach separating Units 1 and 2 and 2000 feet of stream reach separating Units 4 and 5. Unit boundaries were adjusted to allow for the upper 1000 feet of both streams to be protected by a 200 foot no harvest buffer on each side of the stream. The 1000 feet downstream of the buffer area will be harvested to non Bull Trout WFP standards for RMZ harvest.

Estimated Volume: 4.0 MMbf

Area in Acres: 232 Acres

Largest Unit: 84 Acres (Unit 5)

b. Timber stand description pre-harvest (include major timber species and origin date), type of harvest, overall unit objectives.

Currently each harvest unit is dominated by mature grand fir, Douglas fir, and western red cedar. Scattered lodgepole pine, western larch, ponderosa pine, and western white pine can also be found throughout most of the units. This cohort originated approximately 90 years ago following a stand-replacing event. This was most likely the 1910 fires. Stand stagnation, prevalent timber species, over-stocking, and rock type combined with years of fire suppression puts these stands at higher risk for future forest health problems.

The objectives of this harvest are to provide financial return to 03 (Common School) Trust and to return the stands to an early seral condition that is more resistant to disease and insects. Even-aged harvesting leaving 8-12 dominant and co-dominant trees/acre in all units is expected to accomplish this objective. Lop and scatter harvest methods will be utilized to maintain nutrient levels on these sites. Following harvest, a mixture of western larch, western white pine, and ponderosa pine will be planted at approximately 300 trees/acre in all units.

A Type 3 water separates Units 1 and 2. These units total 74 gross acres, which includes approximately nine acres of non-harvestable voids and approximately five acres of regeneration from a 1980s harvest unit. The nine acres of non-harvestable voids are historic root rot pockets and exposed ridges. The five acres of regeneration bound out of the harvest area is fully stocked with 20-year-old ponderosa pine and Douglas fir at approximately 150-300 trees/acre. Grand fir, western red cedar and Douglas fir dominate the remaining timbered areas of these harvest units. A small portion of the timber removed from Unit 1 will be yarded across a private landowner for a distance of approximately 75 feet. Additional trees from this ownership may need to be removed to allow for yarding corridors. All of Unit 1 and approximately 75% of Unit 2 will be harvested by cable yarding methods with the remaining 25% of Unit 2 harvested using ground-based yarding methods. Additionally, a portion of Unit 2 has been excluded from the sale to protect a road failure that occurred in the 1980s. See B.1.d.3.

Unit 3 is approximately 64 gross acres, which includes existing road right of ways, and 63 net acres. This unit is dominated by Douglas fir and grand fir. Non-timbered voids exist throughout this unit as a result of armillaria root rot actions over the years. This disease continues to spread through the Douglas fir elements in the stand. Douglas fir and grand fir regeneration in the unit will be slashed during harvest to help control the spread of root rot and return the stand to early seral condition. This unit will be logged using ground-based harvest methods.

Units 4 and 5 are separated by a Type 3 water. These units total approximately 94 gross acres, which includes existing road right of ways, and 93 net acres. Major timber species are grand fir, Douglas fir, and western red cedar. Scattered ponderosa pine, lodgepole pine, western larch, western white pine can be found throughout the stand. Overstocking has contributed to the infestation of pine beetle and Douglas fir beetle, causing some mortality in the Douglas fir, ponderosa pine, and lodgepole pine component of the stand. Both units will be harvested using ground-based harvest methods.

c. Road activity summary.

See also forest practice application (FPA) and Timber Sale Road Plan for maps and more details.

Type of Activity	How Many	Length (feet) (Estimated)	Acres (Estimated)	Fish Barrier Removals (#)
Construction		2,542'	1	0
Reconstruction		1,653'		0
Abandonment		1,865'	1	0
Bridge Install/Replace				
Culvert Install/Replace (fish)				
Culvert Install/Replace (no fish)				

12. Location of proposal. Give sufficient information for a person to understand the precise location of your proposed project, including a street address, if any, and section, township, and range, if known. If a proposal would occur over a range of area, provide the range or boundaries of the site(s). Provide a legal description, site plan, vicinity map, and topographic map, if reasonably available. While you should submit any plans required by the agency, you are not required to duplicate maps or detailed plans submitted with any permit applications related to this checklist. (See timber sale map. See also color landscape/WAU map on the DNR website <http://www.dnr.wa.gov> under “SEPA Center.”)

a. Legal description:

Parts of Sections 7 and 18, all in Township 35 North, Range 44 East, W.M. and parts of Section 30, Township 35 North, Range 45 East, W.M.

b. Distance and direction from nearest town (include road names):

All units are located approximately 20 miles northeast of Usk, Washington. Units 1, 2, and 3 can be accessed via the Le Clerc Road. Units 4 and 5 can be accessed via the Mill Creek Road.

c. Identify the watershed administrative unit (WAU), the WAU Sub-basin(s), and acres. (See also landscape/WAU map on DNR website <http://www.dnr.wa.gov> under “ SEPA Center.”)

WAU Name	WAU Acres	Proposal Acres
Le Clerc Creek	64289	
Pend Oreille Sub-basin	8070	138
Middle Creek	29272	94

1. Discuss any known future activities not associated with this proposal that may result in a cumulative change in the environment when combined with the past and current proposal(s). (See digital ortho-photos for WAU and adjacency maps on DNR website <http://www.dnr.wa.gov> under “SEPA Center” for a broader landscape perspective.)

This proposal is within the Le Clerc Creek and Middle Creek WAUs. The following is a summary of observations utilizing Forest Practices information, aerial photos flown in 2000, ortho photos, Le Clerc Creek Watershed Analysis, DNR maps and local knowledge. Harvest unit prescriptions have been developed so as to avoid generating any significant peak flow events.

The Le Clerc Creek Watershed Analysis was completed on July 7, 1998. Sediment input into the streams by surface erosion and mass wasting was assessed and prescriptions written to provide protection measures where needed. Prescriptions for erosion and mass wasting were incorporated into the preparation of this proposal.

Approximately 5% of the Le Clerc Creek WAU is non-forest. State ownership comprises approximately 8% of the WAU. This proposal is located in the Pend Oreille Sub-basin and composes less than 1% of the WAU. The state is currently harvesting approximately 4.56 MMbf from Seco timber sale located in Section 36, Township 36 North, Range 44 East, W.M., occupying portions of Seco and Fourth of July sub-basins within the LeClerc Creek WAU. Federal land comprises about 56% of the WAU. Approximately 500 acres have been harvested on federal lands within the last seven years. There are approximately 22,827 acres of private forestland in the WAU. It is estimated that 13,579 acres within the WAU have been harvested or have had an approved Forest Practice Application (FPA) within the last seven years. Of that amount, 42% were even-aged harvests. Most of the timber harvests have occurred in the lower two thirds of the WAU. They are generally found adjacent to and to the east of this proposal. The state expects to have additional harvests in the WAUs, but it is not known where or when at this time. It is not known how much and/or when other landowners with active Forest Practice applications will conduct harvests on their ownership within the Le Clerc Creek WAU.

The Middle Creek WAU totals 29,272 acres. The WAU extends on both the east and west side of the Pend Oreille River encompassing the Pend Oreille River Valley and the associated mountainous terrain. State ownership comprises approximately 18% of the WAU. This proposal composes less than 1% of the WAU. Within the last seven years, the state has harvested approximately 1.2% of its ownership in this WAU. Approximately 53% of those harvests were evenaged harvests and approximately 47% were uneven-aged harvests. The state is currently planning to harvest 4.4 MMbf from Galena Timber Sale located in Section 36, Township 35 North, Range 44 East, W.M. The state expects to have additional harvests in the WAUs, but it is not known where or when at this time. Private land comprises approximately 54% of the land in the WAU. Non-industrial private landowners dominate the lower elevations of the Pend Oreille River Valley, while private industrial landowners dominate the higher elevations of the mountainous terrain. Tribal and county government combined own less than 1% of the WAU. Federal land comprises approximately 13% of the land within the WAU. Of the 23,931 acres not managed by the DNR, about 44% these acres have been harvested in the last seven years. Approximately 40% of these have been even-aged harvests and the remaining 60% have been uneven-aged harvests. It is not known how much and/or when other landowners with active Forest Practice applications will conduct harvests on their ownership within the Middle Creek WAU.

To assure this proposal will not contribute to an increased chance of environment impact, several protection measures have been included in the proposal. Coordinated skidding patterns and landing locations, effective contract administration and normal road maintenance is expected to minimize erosion potential within and adjacent to the proposal area. Water bars and/or drivable dips, ditching and cross drains, out sloping, monitoring, and revegetation of cut slopes and skid trails will be used as needed to minimize the potential for soil erosion, mass wasting events, and contributing to peak flows within each of the WAUs. The Contract Administrator will monitor activities to determine if and when hauling, yarding, and or felling may be suspended if wet weather conditions threaten public resources within the sale area or along the haul routes. County maintained gravel roads will also be monitored for erosion and damage during haul activities. Hauling on all roads, including county roads will be suspended during spring breakup or during wet conditions that would cause significant rutting of road surfaces. Drainage structures have been identified where appropriate to minimize or eliminate the risk of erosion. Additional measures will be incorporated when necessary as determined by the Contract Administrator. Proper road maintenance and cross drainage on the haul route will ensure that water accumulating on the running surfaces will be dispersed onto the undisturbed forest floor. Cable systems will be used on steeper slopes within Unit 2. Harvested areas will be planted to ensure reestablishment of forest cover back on the landscape. The actual change to the amount of forest vegetative cover is expected to be minimal considering the overall size and ownership of the WAU.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS

1. Earth

a. *General description of the site (check one):*

☐Flat, ☐Rolling, ☐Hilly, ☐Steep Slopes, ☒Mountainous, ☐Other:

1) *General description of the WAU or sub-basin(s) (landforms, climate, elevations, and forest vegetation zone).*

The LeClerc Creek WAU is located within the Colville National Forest in northeast corner of Washington, in the Selkirk Mountain region of Pend Oreille County. The Pend Oreille River forms most of the western boundary, to which the WAU is tributary. LeClerc Creek drains 88% of the WAU, with miscellaneous small tributary drainages located adjacent to the river contributing the remaining 12% of the WAU area. Elevations within the WAU range from a low of 2,040 feet along the Pend Oreille River to a high of 6,665 feet at Molybdenite Mountain located on the north rim of the LeClerc Creek Watershed, with nearly 90% of the watershed lying between 2,500 feet and 5,000 feet. Forest vegetation zones within the WAU include the interior cedar/hemlock, grand fir, interior Douglas fir, and subalpine fir zones. (LeClerc Creek Watershed Analysis completed 7/2/98).

The Middle Creek WAU consists of the Pend Oreille River Valley lands, foothills, and the majority of the land is mountainous terrain with elevations ranging from 2100 feet to 6000 feet. It is located directly south of the LeClerc Creek WAU. The WAU extends from North Baldy Mountain in the eastern region of the Pend Oreille River Valley to the Pend Oreille River in the west. Vegetation within the WAU varies with elevation and aspect. Lower elevations and southern aspects are dominated by primarily Douglas fir forests. The drier sites are dominated by ponderosa pine. Higher elevations and northern aspects tend to be dominated by a mixture of western red cedar, Douglas fir, western white pine, western hemlock, grand fir, and lodgepole pine. At the highest elevations, subalpine dominates the landscape. Vegetation zones within the WAU include the interior Douglas fir, grand fir and interior cedar/hemlock zones.

Precipitation and temperature within the WAUs are seasonal (Mediterranean), with more than 75% of the annual precipitation falling between October and March. Precipitation ranges from approximately 25 inches in the lower elevations to approximately 80 inches in the upper elevations of the LeClerc Creek WAU falling primarily as snow. Average precipitation with the Middle Creek WAU is 30-35 inches annually, also falling primarily as snow.

2) Identify any difference between the proposal location and the general description of the WAU or sub-basin(s).

Units 1, 2, and 3 are located in the lower elevations of the WAU and fall into the lowest precipitation class within the LeClerc Creek WAU, 25-29 inches annually. These three units can be found on all aspects and elevations ranging between 2,100 feet and 2,700 feet. Units 4 and 5 are located at the foothills of North Baldy Mountain and occupy gentle south and west aspects. Elevations range from 3,200 feet to 3,600 feet. This proposal is located within the grand fir and interior cedar/hemlock vegetation zones.

b. What is the steepest slope on the site (approximate percent slope)?

The steepest slope on the site is approximately 75% occupying less then 1% of the sale area and can be found within Unit 2.

c. What general types of soils are found on the site (for example, clay, sand, gravel, peat, muck)? If you know the classification of agricultural soils, specify them and note any prime farmland. Note: The following table is created from state soil survey data. It is a roll-up of general soils information for the soils found in the entire sale area. It is only one of several site assessment tools used in conjunction with actual site inspections for slope stability concerns or erosion potential. It can help indicate potential for shallow, rapid soil movement, but often does not represent deeper soil sub-strata. The actual soils conditions in the sale area may vary considerably based on landform shapes, presence of erosive situations, and other factors. The state soil survey is a compilation of various surveys with different standards.

State Soil Survey #	Soil Texture or Soil Complex Name	% Slope	Acres	Mass Wasting Potential	Erosion Potential
8525	Loam	40-65	79	Medium	High
5709	Sandy Loam	0-20	48	Low	Low
5389	Silt Loam	25-40	46	Low	Medium
8236	Gravelly Loam	30-65	30	Medium	High
1742	Silt Loam	0-15	10	Insignificant	Low
8524	Loam	20-40	7	Low	Medium
1604	F. Sandy Loam	0-7	5	No Data	Low
6811	Rock Outcrop Complex - Usk - Complex	30-65	4	No Data	No Data
7390	Skamid-Rock Outcrop Complex	40-65	2	No Data	No Data

d. Are there surface indications or history of unstable soils in the immediate vicinity? If so, describe.

1) Surface indications:

Yes, there are indications of some surface erosion occurring along road cuts within the area and also one known road failure located adjacent to Unit 2 in the LeClerc Creek WAU that occurred in the 1980s, see. B.1.d.3. Within the proposal area, appropriate site-specific road and timber harvest management practices (water bars, drivable dips, proper road location, grass seeding, etc.) will be incorporated as part of this proposal to reduce the potential for mass wasting and surface erosion to occur, see B.1.h.

2) Is there evidence of natural slope failures in the sub-basin(s)?
☒No ☐Yes, type of failures (shallow vs. deep-seated) and failure site characteristics:

3) Are there slope failures in the sub-basin(s) associated with timber harvest activities or roads?
☐No ☒Yes, type of failures (shallow vs. deep-seated) and failure site characteristics:
Associated management activity:

A road failure occurred in the NW¼NW¼ of Section 7, Township 35 North, Range 44 East, W.M., adjacent to Unit 2. The failure was caused by improper road design and location on a steep side-slope and failure to apply proper drainage. Following the failure, the road prism was outsloped and waterbarred to allow for water drainage to the forest floor. No additional failures have occurred on this road since these prevention measures were completed. Additionally, 1,865 feet of road will be abandoned as part of this sale to reduce maintenance needs and to minimize the chance for future failures.

4) Is the proposed site similar to sites where slope failures have occurred previously in the sub-basin(s)?
☐No ☒Yes, describe similarities between the conditions and activities on these sites:

Unit 2 is similar to the location where the road failure occurred and contains portions of the affected road within its boundaries.

5) Describe any slope stability protection measures (including sale boundary location, road, and harvest system decisions) incorporated into this proposal.

The road failure area was excluded from Unit 2 in order to provide additional protection to the area. The road will not be reopened or used as part of this project. The LeClerc Creek Watershed Analysis concluded that minor adjustments to standard road construction and management practices would be adequate to manage hazards associated with road construction and timber harvest within the Pend Oreille Sub-basin. This led to road construction and timber harvest prescriptions for each sub-basin. Those prescriptions will be followed and/or exceeded for this project. Roads will be constructed according to road specifications found in the attached road plan and constructed during

the dry weather season to maximize resource protection. All roads were located on as gentle ground as possible. Coordinated timber harvest skidding patterns, appropriate landing locations, effective contract administration and road maintenance are expected to minimize the erosion and the mass wasting potential. Water bars and/or drivable dips, ditching and cross drains, outslowing, monitoring, and revegetating will be utilized as necessary to meet this objective. See B.1.h

- e. *Describe the purpose, type, and approximate quantities of any filling or grading proposed. Indicate source of fill.*

This project includes approximately 17,259 feet of road that will be maintained/graded in addition to new construction and reconstruction.

Approx. acreage new roads: 1 Approx. acreage new landings: 4 Fill source: On-site as part of road construction

- f. *Could erosion occur as a result of clearing, construction, or use? If so, generally describe.*

There is potential for some erosion to occur as a result of road construction and/or harvest activities associated with this proposal. Management techniques have been identified where appropriate to minimize, reduce, or eliminate the risk of erosion. See B.1.h.

- g. *About what percent of the site will be covered with impervious surfaces after project construction (for example, asphalt or buildings)? Approximate percent of proposal in permanent road running surface (includes gravel roads):*

No impervious surfaces are planned as part of this proposal. Roads and landings cover 1% of proposal area. Roads will be native material with some rock applied to road surfaces near sensitive areas.

- h. *Propose measures to reduce or control erosion, or other impacts to the earth, if any: (Include protection measures for minimizing compaction or rutting.)*

Specific erosion control measures have been identified where appropriate to minimize or eliminate the risk of erosion. Coordinated skidding patterns and landing locations, effective contract administration and normal road maintenance are expected to minimize much of the erosion potential. Water bars and/or drivable dips, ditching and cross drains, out sloping, monitoring, and revegetation of cut slopes and skid trails will be utilized to achieve this objective. Crossdrain structures will conduct and filter water onto the natural vegetation on the forest floor. Energy dissipating structures will be placed at the outfall of crossdrains where necessary to prevent erosion. Headwall of culvert inlets will be rocked. Ditch lines, cut and fill slopes will be revegetated. The Contract Administrator will monitor activities and determine if and when hauling, yarding and/or felling may be suspended if wet weather conditions threaten public resources within or adjacent to the sale area. County maintained gravel roads will also be monitored for erosion during hauling activities. Hauling will be discontinued during spring breakup or when extreme wet conditions would cause excessive rutting or runoff as determined by the Contract Administrator. Proposed protection measures will meet and/or exceed Forest Practice regulations.

2. Air

- a. *What types of emissions to the air would result from the proposal (i.e., dust from truck traffic, rock mining, crushing or hauling, automobile, odors, industrial wood smoke) during construction and when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and give approximate quantities if known.*

This proposed timber harvest will involve vehicle emissions from logging, yarding, and hauling equipment; dust from road construction and logging activities; and dust from log hauling activities. Such emissions would be temporary and is not expected to result in a significant impact to air quality. If broadcast burning/slash burning occurs, it will adhere to the state's Smoke Management Program.

- b. *Are there any off-site sources of emissions or odor that may affect your proposal? If so, generally describe.*

No off-site sources of emissions or odor will affect this proposal.

- c. *Proposed measures to reduce or control emissions or other impacts to air, if any:*

Dust abatement will be performed when needed, as determined by the Contract Administrator. Smoke management requirements will be met with any burning that may occur following conclusion of the timber sale.

3. Water

- a. *Surface:*

- 1) *Is there any surface water body on or in the immediate vicinity of the site (including year-round and seasonal streams, saltwater, lakes, ponds, wetlands)? If yes, describe type and provide names. If appropriate, state what stream or river it flows into. (See timber sale map and forest practice base maps.)*

- a) *Downstream water bodies:*

A type 3 stream separates Units 1 and 2. This stream flows into the Pend Oreille River. Sylvis Creek, a Type 3 stream separates Units 4 and 5. Sylvis Creek flows into Mill Creek which flows into the Pend Oreille River.

b) Complete the following riparian & wetland management zone table:

Wetland, Stream, Lake, Pond, or Saltwater Name (if any)	Water Type	Number (how many?)	Avg RMZ/WMZ Width in Feet (per side for streams)
Sylvia Creek	3	1	120
Un-named	3	1	120

c) List RMZ/WMZ protection measures including silvicultural prescriptions, road-related RMZ/WMZ protection measures, and wind buffers.

Streams were bounded out of the sale units and protected to WFP standards. An additional 200 foot no cut protection buffer was provided for 1000 feet as a control for the CMER study project associated with this proposal, see A.11.

- 2) Will the project require any work over, in, or adjacent to (within 200 feet) to the described waters? If yes, please describe and attach available plans.
☐No ☒Yes (See RMZ/WMZ table above and timber sale map.)
Description (include culverts):

Harvest will occur within the lower 1000 feet of the RMZ study area on both Type 3 waters. Harvest will be conducted to non Bull Trout WFP standards, removing trees in the inner and outer zones of the RMZ.

- 3) Estimate the amount of fill and dredge material that would be placed in or removed from surface water or wetlands and indicate the area of the site that would be affected. Indicate the source of fill material.

No fill or dredge materials will be placed or removed with this proposal.

- 4) Will the proposal require surface water withdrawals or diversions? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known. (Include diversions for fish-passage culvert installation.)
☒No ☐Yes, description:

- 5) Does the proposal lie within a 100-year floodplain? If so, note location on the site plan.
☒No ☐Yes, describe location:

- 6) Does the proposal involve any discharges of waste materials to surface waters? If so, describe the type of waste and anticipated volume of discharge.
☒No ☐Yes, type and volume:

- 7) Does the sub-basin contain soils or terrain susceptible to surface erosion and/or mass wasting? What is the potential for eroded material to enter surface water?

Yes, soils and terrain susceptible to surface erosion and/or mass wasting can be found scattered throughout the WAUs. Naturally occurring surface erosion is an on going process with or without management activities. By following the road specifications mentioned in B.1.h., the potential for erosion is expected to be minimal.

- 8) Is there evidence of changes to the channels in the WAU and sub-basin(s) due to surface erosion or mass wasting (accelerated aggradations, erosion, decrease in large organic debris (LOD), change in channel dimensions)?
☒No ☐Yes, describe changes and possible causes:

Channel pattern, width, and location have not changed significantly along any of the channel segments in the LeClerc WAU since the early 1950s, as revealed by the earliest available aerial photography. Also, mass wasting events have not significantly affected channel morphology (from LeClerc Creek Watershed Analysis). No known evidence in the Middle Creek WAU.

- 9) Could this proposal affect water quality based on the answers to the questions 1-8 above?
☒No ☐Yes, explain:

There is little or no adverse impact to stream flow or water quality anticipated as a result of activities associated with this proposal. Sale unit designs, skidding patterns, operating seasons, and prescriptions are expected to minimize the potential for adverse impacts.

- 10) What are the approximate road miles per square mile in the WAU and sub-basin(s)?
Are you aware of areas where forest roads or road ditches intercept sub-surface flow and deliver surface water to streams, rather than back to the forest floor?
☒No ☐Yes, describe:

Road miles per square mile in the LeClerc Creek WAU are approximately 2.2 miles per section. DNR ownership within the WAU contains approximately 3.6 miles of road per section. Road miles per square mile in the Middle Creek WAU are approximately four miles per section. DNR ownership within the Middle Creek WAU contains approximately three miles of road per section. The percentage of roads carrying water for extended periods would likely be less than 10%, since most water is diverted from or kept off of road surfaces to the greatest extent possible.

- 11) Is the proposal within a significant rain-on-snow (ROS) zone? If not, **STOP HERE** and go to question B-3-a-13 below. Use the WAU or sub-basin(s) for the ROS percentage questions below.
☐No ☒Yes, approximate percent of WAU in significant ROS zone.

Approximately 27% of the Le Clerc Creek WAU and 36% of the Middle Creek WAU are in the ROS zone.

Units 1, 2, and 3 are located within the ROS zone of the Le Clerc Creek WAU.

Approximate percent of sub-basin(s):

Approximately 85% of the Pend Oreille sub-basin is within the ROS zone.

- 12) *If the proposal is within the significant ROS zone, what is the approximate percentage of the WAU or sub-basin(s) within the significant ROS zone (all ownerships) that is (are) rated as hydrologically mature?*

Approximately 51% of the Le Clerc Creek WAU is hydrologically mature and 61% of the Middle Creek WAU is hydrologically mature.

- 13) *Is there evidence of changes to channels associated with peak flows in the WAU or sub-basin(s)?*
☒No ☐Yes, describe observations:

The stream channels within the WAU are relatively small and mostly confined within a narrow valley bottom, where the primary tributaries do meander across a lower gradient valley bottom and would be expected to be responsive to changes in inputs, they are actually flowing across a valley sculpted by past glaciations. The primary tributaries are relatively under fit to the broad, glacial valley bottoms, and perhaps this allows ample buffering for changes in flow and sediment loading. Sediment appears to be stored within the channel or transported downstream, and does not result in channel widening or aggradation of a magnitude that is detectable on the aerial photos. Furthermore, field surveys reveal that the sediment transported to the "response" reaches is primarily sand, rather than gravel. The response of stream channels to inputs of sand tends to be bed fining and pool filling, which would not be detectable on aerial photos.

Some erosion within inner gorge areas was evident along Fourth of July Creek, the Upper East Branch, and a small tributary to Seco Creek. These eroding areas showed only minor increases in vegetation between 1932 and 1994. However, the stream channels adjacent to and downstream of these areas did not show any widening evident on the aerial photos.

The only evidence of a possible debris flow or dam-break flood within the LeClerc WAU was detected near the mouth of Red/White Man Creek (a tributary to west branch LeClerc Creek). Some sparsely vegetated deposition was evident in the canyon bottom in the 1954 photos that was not evident in the 1932 photos. A gradual increase in vegetation occurred on these deposits between 1971 and 1992. Field review of this segment revealed two large debris jams trapping considerable sediment in this location. The channel splits around these "islands", flowing over and around the debris jams. Upstream, the channel is scoured to bedrock for approximately 300 feet (LeClerc Creek Watershed Analysis). Also see B.3.8

- 14) *Based on your answers to questions B-3-a-10 through B-3-a-13 above, describe whether and how this proposal, in combination with other past, current, or reasonably foreseeable proposals in the WAU and sub-basin(s), may contribute to a peak flow impact.*

Implemented protection measures such as proper road design, construction and maintenance, following the Le Clerc Creek WAU prescriptions, RMZ buffers, unit design, and proper skid trail locations are expected to minimize the chance for contributing to any peak flow events. See B.1.h. and A.13 for additional information.

- 15) *Is there water resource (public, domestic, agricultural, hatchery, etc.), or area of slope instability, downstream or downslope of the proposed activity that could be affected by changes in surface water amounts, quality, or movements as a result of this proposal?*
☒No ☐Yes, possible impacts:

There should be little changes to surface water amounts or movements as a result of this proposal.

- 16) *Based on your answers to questions B-3-a-10 through B-3-a-15 above, note any protection measures addressing possible peak flow/flooding impacts.*

This sale is designed to protect any typed surface water. Proper road maintenance and cross drainage will assure that water accumulating on running surfaces will be dispersed onto the undisturbed forest floor. There are no expected changes to surface water amounts or movements as a result of this proposal.

b. *Ground Water:*

- 1) *Will ground water be withdrawn, or will water be discharged to ground water? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.*

Ground water should not be significantly changed by this project. Some surface water discharge (around culverts) may increase ground water. Watering roads for dust abatement may also be used to reduce the loss of road surfacing during dry periods and dust control.

- 2) *Describe waste material that will be discharged into the ground from septic tanks or other sources, if any (for example: Domestic sewage; industrial, containing the following chemicals; agricultural; etc.). Describe the general size of the system, the number of such systems, the number of houses to be served (if applicable), or the number of animals or humans the system(s) are expected to serve.*

No waste materials will be discharged into the ground.

- 3) *Is there a water resource use (public, domestic, agricultural, hatchery, etc.), or area of slope instability, downstream or down slope of the proposed activity that could be affected by changes in groundwater amounts, timing, or movements as a result this proposal?*

☒No ☐Yes, describe:

No significant changes are anticipated due to activities in the proposal area.

a) *Note protection measures, if any.*

Precautions have been taken and are described in questions B.1.h and B.1.5 above.

c. *Water Runoff (including storm water):*

1) *Describe the source of runoff (including storm water) and method of collection and disposal, if any (include quantities, if known). Where will this water flow? Will this water flow into other waters? If so, describe.*

Snowmelt and rain are the main sources of water runoff. Runoff that is intercepted by road surfaces and ditches will be diverted onto the undisturbed forest floor where possible. Culverts have been located to minimize the amount of runoff that may directly enter existing stream channels.

2) *Could waste materials enter ground or surface waters? If so, generally describe.*

None anticipated

a) *Note protection measures, if any.*

d. *Proposed measures to reduce or control surface, ground, and runoff water impacts, if any:
(See surface water, ground water, and water runoff sections above, questions B-3-a-1-c, B-3-a-16, B-3-b-3-a, and B-3-c-2-a.)*

See B.1.h and B.3.a.9., for other measures that will reduce or control surface, ground, and runoff impacts.

4. **Plants**

a. *Check or circle types of vegetation found on the site:*

- ☒deciduous tree: ☒alder, ☒maple, ☒aspen, ☒cottonwood, ☒western larch, ☒birch, ☐other:
☒evergreen tree: ☒Douglas fir, ☒grand fir, ☐Pacific silver fir, ☒ponderosa pine, ☒lodgepole pine,
 ☒western hemlock, ☐mountain hemlock, ☒Englemann spruce, ☐Sitka spruce,
 ☒red cedar, ☐yellow cedar, ☐other:
☒shrubs: ☒huckleberry, ☐salmonberry, ☐salal, ☒other: ninebark, snowberry, ocean spray
☒grass
☐pasture
☐crop or grain
☒wet soil plants: ☐cattail, ☐buttercup, ☐bullrush, ☐skunk cabbage, ☐devil's club, ☒other: wild ginger, bead lilly
☐water plants: ☐water lily, ☐eelgrass, ☐milfoil, ☐other:
☒other types of vegetation: heart leaf arnica, twin flower
☐plant communities of concern:

b. *What kind and amount of vegetation will be removed or altered? (See answers to questions A-11-a, A-11-b, B-3-a-1-b and B-3-a-1-c. The following sub-questions merely supplement those answers.)*

1) *Describe the species, age, and structural diversity of the timber types immediately adjacent to the removal area.
(See landscape/WAU and adjacency maps on the DNR website at: <http://www.dnr.wa.gov> under "SEPA Center.")*

The western boundary of Unit 1 is adjacent to an even-aged harvest that has successfully regenerated with 150+ trees per acre (TPA). The northern and western boundary of Unit 3 is also adjacent to an even-aged harvest that has successfully regenerated with 150+ TPA. A conifer plantation exists within Unit 2 of 20-year-old ponderosa pine and Douglas fir at approximately 200 TPA. The remaining portions of Units 1, 2, and 3 are surrounded by mature timber stands that originated more than 80 years ago. These stands are composed of Douglas fir, grand fir, lodgepole pine, western white pine, ponderosa pine, western larch, western hemlock, and Englemann spruce. Units 4 and 5 are bordered by a single cohort stand to the south that originated following a 1980's evenaged harvest. This area is currently stocked with 300+ TPA ranging from 10 feet to 25 feet tall. A small area along the northwestern boundary of Unit 4 and the northern boundary of Unit 5 are adjacent to a single cohort stand that originated following a 1980's even-aged harvest. These stands are dominated by lodgepole pine at 400+ TPA ranging from 5 feet to 15 feet tall. The remaining portions of Units 4 and 5 are surrounded by mature timber stands that originated approximately 95 years ago. These stands are composed of Douglas fir, grand fir, lodgepole pine, western white pine, ponderosa pine, western larch, western hemlock, and Englemann spruce.

2) *Retention tree plan:*

Retention trees will be randomly scattered and throughout the units at 8 to 12 TPA. Severity of the site, size class, species, density of existing stands, and evidence of disease or insects determined retention tree selection. Ponderosa pine and western larch were preferred as leave trees. DNR legacy leave tree requirements will be met with this proposal.

c. *List threatened or endangered plant species known to be on or near the site.*

TSU Number	FMU_ID	Common Name	Federal Listing Status	WA State Listing Status
None Found in Database Search				

d. *Proposed landscaping, use of native plants, or other measures to preserve or enhance vegetation on the site, if any:*

Grass seeding of spur roads and landing areas are planned to improve forage and decrease the possibility of noxious weed infestation. Upon the completion of harvest, units will be planted with ponderosa pine, western larch, and western white pine at 300 TPA. Natural regeneration of Douglas fir, grand fir, and lodgepole pine is also expected.

5. **Animal**

a. *Circle or check any birds animals or unique habitats which have been observed on or near the site or are known to be on or near the site:*

birds: ☒hawk, ☐heron, ☐eagle, ☒songbirds, ☐pigeon, ☒other: grouse
mammals: ☒deer, ☒bear, ☒elk, ☐beaver, ☒other: moose, cougar, bobcat.
fish: ☐bass, ☐salmon, ☒trout, ☐herring, ☐shellfish, ☐other:
unique habitats: ☐talus slopes, ☐caves, ☐cliffs, ☐oak woodlands, ☐balds, ☐mineral springs

b. *List any threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site (include federal- and state-listed species).*

TSU Number	FMU_ID	Common Name	Federal Listing Status	WA State Listing Status
1	42809	Grizzly Bear	Threatened	Endangered
1	42809	Gray Wolf	Threatened	Endangered
1	44269	Grizzly Bear	Threatened	Endangered
1	44269	Gray Wolf	Threatened	Endangered
2	42810	Grizzly Bear	Threatened	Endangered
2	42810	Gray Wolf	Threatened	Endangered
2	44270	Grizzly Bear	Threatened	Endangered
2	44270	Gray Wolf	Threatened	Endangered
3	44278	Grizzly Bear	Threatened	Endangered
3	44278	Gray Wolf	Threatened	Endangered
4	44271	Grizzly Bear	Threatened	Endangered
4	44271	Gray Wolf	Threatened	Endangered
4	44273	Grizzly Bear	Threatened	Endangered
4	44273	Gray Wolf	Threatened	Endangered
5	44272	Grizzly Bear	Threatened	Endangered
5	44272	Gray Wolf	Threatened	Endangered
5	44274	Lynx	Threatened	Threatened
5	44274	Grizzly Bear	Threatened	Endangered
5	44274	Gray Wolf	Threatened	Endangered

c. *Is the site part of a migration route? If so, explain.*
☒Pacific flyway ☐Other migration route: *Explain if any boxes checked:*

All of Washington State is considered part of the Pacific Flyway. No impacts are anticipated as a result of this proposal.

d. *Proposed measures to preserve or enhance wildlife, if any:*

This proposal is expected to have an overall positive affect on wildlife species that favor early seral forest habitats. Approximately four to five acres of Unit 3 falls into the Selkirk Grizzly Bear Recovery Zone. Planned activities are not expected to adversely affect habitat requirements within the recovery zone. Part of Unit 5 (16.4 acres) falls within a LAU in the Salmo Priest Lynx Management Zone. Activities within this unit are not expected to have an adverse impact. Retention trees, which include legacy trees, wildlife reserve trees, and green recruitment trees will be left randomly scattered throughout the units to provide habitat for species utilizing snags and down woody debris. No snags will be felled during harvesting operations, except for Labor and Industry safety considerations or operational reasons.

1) *Note existing or proposed protection measures, if any, for the complete proposal described in question A-11.*

Species /Habitat:	Lynx	Protection Measures: See Lynx Habitat Management Plan
Species /Habitat:	Grizzly Bear	Protection Measures: See Selkirk Grizzly Bear Recovery Plan
Species /Habitat:		Protection Measures:

6. **Energy and Natural Resources**

a. *What kinds of energy (electric, natural gas, oil, wood stove, solar) will be used to meet the completed project’s energy needs? Describe whether it will be used for heating, manufacturing, etc.*

None needed

b. *Would your project affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties? If so, generally describe.*

No

c. *What kinds of energy conservation features are included in the plans of this proposal? List other proposed measures to reduce or control energy impacts, if any:*

None are included in this proposal.

7. **Environmental Health**

- a. *Are there any environmental health hazards, including exposure to toxic chemicals, risk of fire and explosion, spill, or hazardous waste, that could occur as a result of this proposal? If so, describe.*

Minimal hazard incident to operating or working around heavy machinery. Minor spillage of fuel and oil lubricants is always possible. The risk of forest fire is always present and may be increased for a year or so due to logging slash prior to green up.

- 1) *Describe special emergency services that might be required.*

Washington Department of Ecology will be notified if any significant spills occur and appropriate action will be taken. Department of Natural Resources, local fire districts on hand to suppress fires. Emergency medical or air ambulance for personal injuries.

- 2) *Proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards, if any:*

Compliance with existing state laws regarding environmental health hazards. Fire equipment will be required on site during fire season.

- b. *Noise*

- 1) *What types of noise exist in the area which may affect your project (for example: traffic, equipment, operation, other)?*

None

- 2) *What types and levels of noise would be created by or associated with the project on a short-term or long-term basis (for example: traffic, construction, operation, other)? Indicate what hours noise would come from this site.*

During the road construction, maintenance, and harvest activities, there will be some noise associated with heavy equipment, chain saws, and log truck operations.

- 3) *Proposed measures to reduce or control noise impacts, if any:*

Noise levels are not expected to result in a significant impact. Therefore, no mitigating measures are planned.

8. Land and Shoreline Use

- a. *What is the current use of the site and adjacent properties? (Site includes the complete proposal, e.g. rock pits and access roads.)*

The site and adjacent properties are currently used for production of timber, dispersed recreation activities, such as hunting, hiking, mushroom gathering, and berry picking.

- b. *Has the site been used for agriculture? If so, describe.*

No

- c. *Describe any structures on the site.*

None known

- d. *Will any structures be demolished? If so, what?*

No

- e. *What is the current zoning classification of the site?*

There is no zoning in rural Pend Oreille County.

- f. *What is the current comprehensive plan designation of the site?*

Rural

- g. *If applicable, what is the current shoreline master program designation of the site?*

There is no current shoreline master program designation for this site.

- h. *Has any part of the site been classified as an "environmentally sensitive" area? If so, specify.*

None are known

- i. *Approximately how many people would reside or work in the completed project?*

No people will reside or work on the site after harvest.

- j. *Approximately how many people would the completed project displace?*

No people will be displaced. No people reside within the proposal area.

- k. *Proposed measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts, if any:*

There will not be any displacement impacts.

- l. *Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with existing and projected land uses and plans, if any:*

This proposal is compatible with existing and projected land uses, such as timber production, dispersed recreational activities and use by wildlife for forage, travel, and cover.

9. Housing

- a. *Approximately how many units would be provided, if any? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.*
No housing will be provided.
- b. *Approximately how many units, if any, would be eliminated? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.*
None
- c. *Proposed measures to reduce or control housing impacts, if any:*
None needed

10. Aesthetics

- a. *What is the tallest height of any proposed structure(s), not including antennas; what is the principle exterior building material(s) proposed?*
No structures are proposed.
- b. *What views in the immediate vicinity would be altered or obstructed?*
Minor impact to aesthetics due to timber removal and road construction.
- 1) *Is this proposal visible from a residential area, town, city, developed recreation site, or a scenic vista?*
☒No ☐Yes, viewing location:
- 2) *Is this proposal visible from a major transportation or designated scenic corridor (county road, state or interstate highway, US route, river, or Columbia Gorge SMA)?*
☐No ☒Yes, scenic corridor name:

A small portion of Unit 2 and Unit 3 may be visible from Highway 20 on the west side of the Pend Oreille River and along the Le Clerc Road on the east side of the river.
- 3) *How will this proposal affect any views described in 1) or 2) above?*
Stands will be more open following harvest.
- c. *Proposed measures to reduce or control aesthetic impacts, if any:*
No specific measures taken to reduce or control aesthetic impacts.

11. Light and Glare

- a. *What type of light or glare will the proposal produce? What time of day would it mainly occur?*
Possibly glare from logging equipment during daytime hours.
- b. *Could light or glare from the finished project be a safety hazard or interfere with views?*
The finished proposal will not create glare or light problems or interfere with views.
- c. *What existing off-site sources of light or glare may affect your proposal?*
No off-site sources of light or glare will affect this proposal.
- d. *Proposed measures to reduce or control light and glare impacts, if any:*
None needed

12. Recreation

- a. *What designated and informal recreational opportunities are in the immediate vicinity?*
Informal hunting, camping, snowmobiling, mountain biking, wood cutting, horseback riding, and other forms of dispersed recreation.
- b. *Would the proposed project displace any existing recreational uses? If so, describe:*
During harvest operations, areas of the timber sale and haul routes will be unsafe for recreation due to timber harvesting operations.
- c. *Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation, including recreation opportunities to be provided by the project or applicant, if any:*

Signs may be posted in the vicinity to warn individuals that timber harvest/log hauling activities are occurring. No specific recreational opportunities will be provided by the proposal, it is possible that hunting in the area will increase following harvest due to possible higher concentration of game animals preferring early seral species concentrated near the harvest area.

13. Historic and Cultural Preservation

- a. *Are there any places or objects listed on, or proposed for national, state, or local preservation registers known to be on or next to the site? If so, generally describe.*

Washington Forest Practices and Office of Archaeological and Historical Preservation (OAHP) were contacted regarding historic/archaeological sites for this proposal. A map showing harvest boundaries was faxed to (OAHP) and DNR was notified that there were no Archaeological/Historic conflicts with this proposal.

- b. *Generally describe any landmarks or evidence of historic, archaeological, scientific, or cultural importance known to be on or next to the site.*

No landmarks or evidence of the above was found on the site.

- c. *Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts, if any:
(Include all meetings or consultations with tribes, archaeologists, anthropologists or other authorities.)*

If an unknown historic or cultural resource is discovered during the operation, the following process will occur: 1) Cease operations affecting the discovered site. 2) Physically identify the site on the ground so it can be located and impacts mitigated (a buffer if necessary). 3) Contact region state lands assistant and district manager, and work in collaboration on timing, confidentiality, and notification of tribes and other affected parties. Also see B.3.13.a

14. Transportation

- a. *Identify public streets and highways serving the site, and describe proposed access to the existing street system. Show on site plans, if any.*

Two access routes serve the site. USFS 12 gravel road (E354433A), which provides access to Units 4 and 5 from the paved county road, Le Clerc Road. The Dry Canyon Road, a graveled County road provides access to Units 1 and 2 from Le Clerc Road. Unit 3 is accessed directly from Le Clerc Road. Refer to the timber sale vicinity map for details.

- 1) *Is it likely that this proposal will contribute to an existing safety, noise, dust, maintenance, or other transportation impact problem(s)?*

There currently is no existing transportation problem to which this proposal would contribute. It is possible that this proposal could add noise, dust, maintenance or safety problems on the haul route during the operational periods of this project. Warning signs will be posted informing the public of timber harvesting and hauling activities.

- b. *Is site currently served by public transit? If not, what is the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop?*

No public transit in rural Pend Oreille County.

- c. *How many parking spaces would the completed project have? How many would the project eliminate?*

None are planned with this proposal.

- d. *Will the proposal require any new roads or streets, or improvements to existing roads or streets, not including driveways? If so, generally describe (indicate whether public or private).*

- 1) *How does this proposal impact the overall transportation system/circulation in the surrounding area, if at all?*

This proposal should have no significant impact on the current transportation system. Any impact all will be temporary, and limited to the period of time during which operations are being conducted. Access to existing roads in the sale area may be restricted during operations, as needed for safety. Public use on newly constructed/reopened roads will be restricted during the sale activity.

- e. *Will the project use (or occur in the immediate vicinity of) water, rail, or air transportation? If so, generally describe.*

No

- f. *How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project? If known, indicate when peak volumes would occur.*

This proposal should result in no increase in vehicle trips per day upon completion of the timber sale. However, log hauling may involve from approximately five to 20 loads per day during the course of operations. Also, see B.14.d.1., above.

- g. *Proposed measures to reduce or control transportation impacts, if any:*

Log hauling will not be allowed during spring breakup or during wet conditions as determined by the Contract Administrator.

15. Public Services

- a. *Would the project result in an increased need for public services (for example: fire protection, police protection, health care, schools, other)? If so, generally describe.*

The project would not result in an increased need for public services.

b. *Proposed measures to reduce or control direct impacts on public services, if any.*

There are no measures planned to reduce or control impacts on public services, as there are no impacts expected as a result of this proposal.

16. **Utilities**

a. *Circle utilities currently available at the site: electricity, natural gas, water, refuse service, telephone, sanitary sewer, septic system, other.*

There are no utilities within the proposal area.

b. *Describe the utilities that are proposed for the project, the utility providing the service, and the general construction activities on the site or in the immediate vicinity which might be needed.*

No utility services are needed for this project. No utility services will be generated following completion of the project.

C. **SIGNATURE**

The above answers are true and complete to the best of my knowledge. I understand that the lead agency is relying on them to make its decision.

Completed by: _____ Date: _____
Cody Rohrbach Arcadia District Forester 1

Reviewed by: _____ Date: _____
Andrew Stenbeck Arcadia District Manager

Reviewed by: _____ Date: _____
Bob McKellar Management Forester

files\tbs\76192 eis.doc